

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

T.H.E. INSURANCE COMPANY,  
Plaintiff(s),  
v.  
LAS VEGAS CARRIAGE, LLC, et al.,  
Defendant(s). } Case No. 2:15-cv-00512-RFB-NJK  
} ORDER  
} (Docket No. 42)

Pending before the Court is the parties' joint proposed discovery plan. Docket No. 42. Discovery plans "must include on the last page of the plan the words 'IT IS SO ORDERED' with a date and signature block for the judge in a manner set forth in LR IA 6-2." LR 26-1(b)(10). LR IA 6-2 provides that "[t]his signature block must not begin on a separate page" and must identify the appropriate judge. LR IA 6-2. The parties' joint proposed discovery plan includes a signature block that begins on a separate page. Docket No. 42 at 6. The parties' signature block also identifies the incorrect judge. *See id.*

Additionally, where more than 180 days of discovery are sought, the proposed discovery plan must state in its heading, “SPECIAL SCHEDULING REVIEW REQUESTED.” LR 26-1. Despite the Court’s prior order advising the parties of this requirement, the parties fail to request special scheduling review properly. Docket No. 42 at 1; *see also* Docket No. 41.

11

11

1 Therefore, the parties' joint proposed discovery plan is **DENIED** without prejudice for failure  
2 to comply with LR IA 6-2 and LR 26-1. The parties must file a new joint proposed discovery plan that  
3 complies in full with the Local Rules, no later than August 9, 2016.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 DATED: August 5, 2016

6   
7 NANCY J. KOPPE  
8 United States Magistrate Judge

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28